

Remarks

Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's outstanding Office Action mailed November 2, 2006, with a shortened three month response interval. As explained below, the pending claims are neither anticipated nor made obvious by the prior art of record alone or in combination. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Embodiments of the invention unlike conventional fire alarm or regional monitoring systems detect the presence of developing fire conditions based on audio received from various portions of the region being monitored. In one aspect of the invention, the received audio can be analyzed to determine the presence of a fire profile. Such systems can be used independently or in conjunction with known types of smoke or heat detectors. Alternately, in other embodiments of the invention, a graphical display output device can be provided on which location related audio information which has been received from various of the transducers can be presented in a two dimensional format, for example, to indicate the presence of individuals or developing fire conditions in the vicinity of the source of the respective audio signals.

Mori U.S. Patent 4,851,823 as explained below does not anticipate or make obvious any of the pending claims. Mori is a system which determines the presence of fire in a guest room by means of a fire detector 1, see Fig. 1 thereof. In response to a detected fire condition, a lamp corresponding to the location of the currently active fire detector can be "turned on through the operation of the fire detector 1." (Mori, col. 2, ll. 21, 22). Thus, Mori teaches the use of a fire detector, which would conventionally be for example a smoke or heat detector 1 located in the region of interest to make the determination of a developing fire condition. This determination represented by an electrical signal, is then coupled to control box 10 where it is used to illuminate a light bulb 16 (see Fig. 2 thereof). Mori appears to provide only a single light bulb 16 for all of the rooms which might have fire detectors which are coupled to the control box 10. Unlike the

claimed invention, Mori includes no circuitry which would enable that system to develop a fire profile over a period of time or a history of signals received.

Further, neither Mori alone nor Mori read in view of Markowitz et al. U.S. Patent 6,295,346 render any of the pending claims obvious. Mori, noted above, makes a determination of a fire condition by means of a fire detector 1 located in a region being monitored. A signal indicative of a detected fire is coupled to the control box 10. Markowitz et al., relied on by the Examiner in support of the rejections of various of the claims as obvious, does not obviate the deficiencies of Mori alone or in combination. In relying on Markowitz et al., in part, in rejecting pending claim 3, now incorporated into amended claim 1, the Examiner stated:

"Markowitz et al. . . . teaches how to use speech recognition software to help identify the urgent message from a remote location." (page 4, Section 7 of Office Action)

However, the above fails to address the wording of claim 3, now incorporated into claim 1. As noted above, Mori makes an alarm determination using a fire detector, such as detector 1, located in a region of interest. (See Fig. 1 thereof). Such fire detectors would for example be implemented as smoke detectors, heat detectors or the like which respond to local ambient conditions indicative of a fire. Such is not in keeping with the wording of pending claim 3, now incorporated into amended claim 1. Indeed, Mori, alone or in combination with Markowitz et al. teaches away from the claimed structures in that it relies on a signal from the local detector 1 indicative of a fire condition.

Thus, as explained above, since Mori merely responds to a signal from a fire detector 1 indicative of the presence of a sensed fire to energize a common light bulb 16 it can neither anticipate nor render obvious the pending claims. Markowitz et al. fails to address inefficiencies of Mori in these regards as do Yokoi et al. and Cohen et al. for at least the above reasons.

Thus, the pending claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Mori alone or in combination with Markowitz et al., Yokoi et al. and/or Cohen et al. Hence, for at least the above reasons it is requested that the pending claims in the application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By:



Paul M. Vargo
Reg. No. 29,116
Attorney for Applicants

Jan 29, 2007

120 South Riverside Plaza
Floor 22
Chicago, IL 60606-3912
(312) 655-1500